



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTES.

DIE PERSONENNAMEN IN DEN KEILSCHRIFTURKUNDEN AUS DER ZEIT DER KÖNIGE VON UR UND ISIN. Von *Dr. P. Engelbert Huber, O.F.M. Assyriologische Bibliothek*, herausgegeben von *Friedrich Delitzsch* und *Paul Haupt*, XXI. Leipsic: Hinrichs, 1907. Pp. viii, 208. Price 36 m.

This volume contains the following chapters: (1) Preface; (2) List of abbreviations used in the book; (3) Introduction; (4) Enumeration of the several texts and publications from which the "personal names" have been extracted. This paragraph embodies also a discussion of the "mode of dating" the tablets, of the "nomenclature of the months," etc.; (5) The formation of the "personal names"; (6) Classification of names; (7) Names of women; (8) The "sacred names" used in the formation of the *nomina propria*, such as "names of gods," "sacred districts," "sacred cities," "sacred *Kultstätten*," "sacred symbols," "sacred *Kultgegenstände*," "deified kings," "foreign deities"; (9) List of "personal names" occurring in the documents of this period, so far published. This list is followed by an enumeration of the "names of gods," "names of deified kings," "names of temples," "names of cities," "names of rivers," and all other "predicative elements" which form part of the "personal names."

Seeing that the most important part of the book is the "List of personal names," I shall confine myself to that chapter. Right here, however, I must mention the fact, in order not to be misunderstood, that Huber, having been a pupil of Professor Hommel, would naturally follow quite closely in the footsteps of his teacher and master. Not only in the introductory chapters, but all through the book, in the several notes and explanations, we can detect the teachings of Professor Hommel, which are, though very often quite ingenious, mostly against the reviewer's own conception of the religion of Babylonia. It would, therefore, be entirely out of place here to argue against them with the pupil, instead of the master. Apart from this very marked influence every student of the religion and history of the Sumerians and Semitic Babylonians will know, I am sure, that most cordial thanks are due to Dr. Huber for his labors and pains in having put before the scholars and the public in general a compendium of names which reveal to us the very heart throbbings, the religious aspirations, feelings and teachings of a people living about 700 years before the time of Abraham, i. e., at about 2700-2300 B. C. In fact, the contents of this book are so important that no student of religion and history, but especially no student of the Sumerian and early Semitic Babylonian language, will be able to do without it. In short, the names contained in this book are a veritable mine of information.

On account of the importance of these names it is the more to be regretted that Huber was not quite equal to his task, that he was not able to do justice both to himself and the names here treated. It almost seems to me that the author undertook a subject which was and is somewhat beyond his capacities both as a Sumerian or Semitic linguist and as a student of religions—and this notwithstanding the fact that Huber himself is a theologian.

When using this book—in order to be reasonably certain of either the proposed readings or translations—the student will have to refer constantly to the original, so little reliable are the readings and translations. Single signs and whole groups of signs have been either misread, or misunderstood, or left out, or wrongly divided, or wrongly connected. In some instances only the first half of the name is given, while the other half is left out. In other instances the first half of the name is omitted, while the other half is registered. Sometimes the official title of a person has been made to be a part of his name, while at other times what was considered to be a title and hence was omitted in the transcription, forms an integral part of the name. The alphabetical arrangement is most careless, thus preventing the student, in many cases at least, to find the exact place where a name may or may not have been registered. Considering all these shortcomings, it is with a great deal of regret that we have to say that Huber had under discussion one of the finest subjects from a religio-historic standpoint, but he missed his opportunity!

To give and correct here all the mistakes, misreadings, and mistranslations would lead me too far. I shall confine myself, therefore, to a few most flagrant examples, which would justify the above-given criticism.

P. 41a, *ni-ku* in *A-a-ni-ku*, though followed by *lugh*, is a title. P. 42a.b, *Ab-ush(!)-shu-shag-ga*, *Ab-ta(!)-shu-shag-ga* and *Ab-ba-ush(!)-shu-shag-ga* are one and the same name. P. 44a, the *nu*, in *A-ga-nu*, belongs to the title *nu(!)-banda-gud*, which follows the name. *A-gish(?)*-*gibil-gim* is, of course, identical with the name read on p. 41b, *A-ba(!)-bil-gim*. P. 45a, *a-mur*, can never mean, according to Assyrian grammar, “*siehe!*”! *A-mur-En-zu* means “behold, oh Sin!” This also against the corrections on p. 208, where the translation “*ich schaute*” is proposed. *A-chu-um-ilu* means “A is god.” *A-chu-ba-am* has to be transcribed *A-chu-iqisha-am* (or *qā'isham*), i. e., “A. has given,” or “is the giver” (i. e., of life or of a son etc.). P. 46a, *Al-la-bil* has to be read *pa-al shangu-ne*. P. 47a, *Ama-ra-ki-ag-ra* is no *nom. propr.*, but signifies “to his beloved mother,” notice the verb *ba-an-na-gi-in* which follows it. *Shim* in *Ama-shim* is the sign *SHIM+PI*. P. 47b, the first three names, beginning with *apin*, are no *nom. pr.*, but official titles. On p. 48b we are told that *Azag-ga-ni* is the father of *Nam-gin-tur-na-mu-tar*. But on pp. 138b, 139a the latter name is divided into two, i. e., *Nam-gin* is said to be the son (*tur*) of *Na-mu-tar* and of *Azag-ga-ni*! Does Huber call this *uniformity*, or will he deny in the face of this example that he had not the faintest idea of what he was registering? The passage from which these names are taken reads “so and so much for *Azag-ga-ni*, so and so much for *nam-gin-tur Na-mu-tar-dumu-ni*,” i. e., “for the ‘child’s service’ of *Na-mu-tar*, his child”; in other words, *Na-mu-tar* was a daughter (! *gin*=*amatu*, *nam-gin*=*amtātu*, *nam-gin-tur*=*amtātu sha märtu*, or something like it) of *Azag-ga-ni*; both, father and daughter, have hired themselves out and receive their wages! P. 49a, *Azag-lal* does not belong to the *nom. pr.* *Shesh-kal-la*, see p. 152a. The *A* in such names as *A-ga-ga*, *A-gish-gar-ra*,

A-gu-gu, A-gul, A-da-da, A-lul-lul, etc., etc., is not a part of the name but signifies "hire, wages," i. e., *A=bi-lat*, see *B. E.*, XVII, part 1, p. 38, note 13. P. 49b, the names *E-a-gal* (read *galu*)-*bi* and *E-a-gal-gu* belong together. Neither "*E. ist der Mann des Wortes*" nor "*E. ist der Mann von Gu*" is a correct translation. The sign read *bi* or *gu* is the same as that of *REC* 555, i. e., it is *duq*. Br. 5891; Meissner 4216; cf. Thureau-Dangin, *Z. A.*, XVIII, 120, 2. *Gal* *duq* again is an abbreviation of *galu duq-qa-pur=pacharu*, "potter," cf. II R 58, 57b, *dingir duq-qa-pur=ilu E-A shá pa-cha-ri*. Both names, therefore, have to be translated "Ea is (was) the potter," i. e., "Ea has formed, created those persons." P. 51a, the "15" does not belong to *E-si*, cf. *loc. cit.*, col. III, 14. *Edina* has to be read *RIQ* or *SHIM* and is an official title. P. 51b read *En-ud-sud-[shu]*. For *En-(d)Ba-u* read *A-SHAG asag (d) Ba-u*. *En-(d) Nannar* and *En-(d) Innanna-Unuk* are no proper names but signify "priest (*pashishu*) of N, and I." *En-lil-ki* is likewise not a proper name, but *dumu En-lil-ki* means "a Nippurian." P. 52a *Erin-da, Ib-da* (p. 52b), *U'-da* (p. 55b) are one and the same name; the first reading is the only correct one. P. 52b, *gal-til* does not belong to *Igi-bar*. P. 54a read *I-be-Sin*. P. 54b *Ish-da-gan* is only the second half of the name, cf. p. 154a, above. P. 55a, *ni-ku* does not belong to *I-til* (*I-til-a=In-til-la!*). *U-edin* has been misread; read (*sham*) *Shim-e* and cf. *En-u (=sham)-shim-ma*, p. 51a. The same misreadings we find again in *U-edin-Ba-u, Lugal-u-edin, Nin-u-edin*. P. 55b after *Utu-ma-Nina-ki* the *TAG* has been left out, for this name and its pronunciation see Br., Meissner, and Thureau-Dangin. P. 57a, for *Uru-gal-gir-uru* read *Ush galu gir-nita*, i. e., "Ush, the *shakanakku*!" (*Uru*)-*dun-gi-sib-kalam-ma* has been registered already on p. 56b. P. 58a, read *Gir* (or *Ur*)-*ra-ur-sag* for *Uru-ra*. *Gin-ush-shal-mach* (p. 59a) and *pa-al* (p. 59b) after *Ur-E* are titles. P. 60a and p. 70a read *Ur-en-gal* (instead of *ku!*)-*du-du*. P. 60b read *Ur-Ba-gá* (instead of *bi!*). P. 61a read *Ur-lil* (for *gal*)-*li*, cf. p. 64a. P. 69b read *Ur-zu-[ab]* and the name immediately following *Ur-du(l)-shar-gub-ba*, cf. p. 63a. P. 70a read *Ur-En-zu* (! for *u*). P. 75a read for *Ur-(d) ba-dug=Ur-(d) Dul-shar-gub*. P. 76a read *Ur-Engur* (for *d*) *gar*). P. 77a read [...]-*an (d) Ba-u* for *Ur-(d) dingir-ba-ú*. P. 79b sub *Ur-kal-kal* cf. *Mi-da* with *Uri-da* (p. 56a)! P. 82b read *Ur-(d) En-lil-lá* for *Ur-(d) Sa-lal*. P. 83a *Uz-nam* is interesting. The tablet from which this name is taken is an "inventory," the line in which this name (!?) occurs reads *uz nam-banda NIN-AN-ra*, i. e., "the goats (=uz) of the prefecture belonging to *NIN-AN*," for which see also *B. E.*, XVII, p. 4, note 8.

But *sapienti sat!*

HUGO RADAU.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., Aug. 26, 1908.

Two publications lie before us which are an exposition of the bitter controversies that have ranged in Philadelphia concerning the dignity and ability of Prof. H. V. Hilprecht. We have abstained from making any reference to this very important affair, and do not now propose to enter into the details of the discussion. The publications before us contain a thorough exposition of the subject, and one of them, published by Professor Hilprecht himself, contains all the documents, evidences, and statements that have been offered pro and con. We learn that Professor Hilprecht is again in Europe, and fur-